

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

REC'D 13 FEB 2006

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

PCT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 60469-099		FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No. PCT/US03/31551	International filing date (day/month/year) 07 October 2003 (07.10.2003)	Priority date (day/month/year)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC IPC(7): B66B 5/04 and US Cl.: 187/ 286,247,305,372,373,375,376,391			
Applicant OTIS ELEVATOR COMPANY			
<p>1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.</p> <p>2. This REPORT consists of a total of 3 sheets, including this cover sheet.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).</p> <p>These annexes consist of a total of _____ sheets.</p>			
<p>3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <p>I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Basis of the report</p> <p>II <input type="checkbox"/> Priority</p> <p>III <input type="checkbox"/> Non-establishment of report with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</p> <p>IV <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of unity of invention</p> <p>V <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</p> <p>VI <input type="checkbox"/> Certain documents cited</p> <p>VII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain defects in the international application</p> <p>VIII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain observations on the international application</p>			
Date of submission of the demand 05 April 2005 (05.04.2005)		Date of completion of this report 25 January 2006 (25.01.2006)	
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/ US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201		Authorized officer <i>Lydia Dene For</i> Jonathan Salata Telephone No. 703-308-0956	

Form PCT/IPEA/409 (cover sheet)(July 1998)

I. Basis of the report**1. With regard to the elements of the international application:***

- ☒ the international application as originally filed.
- ☒ the description:
pages 1-8 _____ as originally filed
pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the claims:
pages 9-12a _____, as originally filed
pages NONE _____, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the drawings:
pages 1-5 _____, as originally filed
pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
pages NONE _____, as originally filed
pages NONE _____, filed with the demand
pages NONE _____, filed with the letter of _____.

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☒ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☒ the description, pages None
- ☒ the claims, Nos. None
- ☒ the drawings, sheets/Fig None

5. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).**

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17).

** Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.
PCT/US03/31551**V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement****1. STATEMENT**

Novelty (N)

Claims 1-21 YESClaims NONE NO

Inventive Step (IS)

Claims NONE YESClaims 1-21 NO

Industrial Applicability (IA)

Claims 1-21 YESClaims NONE NO**2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS**

Claims 1-21 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Jin (6,318,507) in view of Skalski et al (6,161,653) and Fargo et al (6269910). Jin teaches in figures 1-6, and elevator emergency stop device which is actuated under emergency conditions. Jin teaches the substitution of a cable 210 instead of a link mechanism to lower cost.

Skalski et al teaches that it advantageous to substitute between types of brake actuation such as ropes, magnetic or eddy current and illustrates a system without a rope. Thus, to substitute between types of brake actuators would have been an obvious engineering design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art based on merely cost.

Jin and Skalski et al do not teach remote actuation. Fargo et al teaches that it is advantageous to provide remote actuation of the stopping device in an elevator in order to provide a rescue operation within a machine room-less elevator and not require a skilled operator to use. Thus, to provide remote actuation would have been an obvious engineering design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow unskilled operators to use.

Claims 1-21 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meet industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.